

Solicitation Number: SOL-294-17-000003**Questions Received from Prospective Offerors- Round Two**

1. Is the Evaluation Approach (Annex F) of the Palestinian Municipal Development Project a hypothetical example or will this evaluation be carried out under this award, and if so, what year would this projected be carried out?

Answer: This is a hypothetical example.

2. If there is an existing CPARS for the past performances references does the offeror still need to include a PPIRS form within the Annex D? Or are the PPIRS forms only for the past performance references that do not have CPARS?

Answer: Yes, all offerors must include the PPIRS report even if there is an existing CPARS. We need either the CPARS or the PPIRS report. The Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) serves as the single source for contractor past performance data. PPIRS functions as the central warehouse for performance assessment reports received from the following Federal performance information collection systems:

- (1) Contractor Performance System (CPS)
- (2) Past Performance Data Base (PPDB)
- (3) Architect-Engineer Contract Administration Support System (ACASS)
- (4) Construction Contractor Appraisal Support System (CCASS)
- (5) Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS)

3. The original solicitation which was released on February 8th defined a major subcontractor as “one whose proposed cost exceeds 15% of the offeror’s total proposed cost”. The Q&A posted on March 2 changed the definition from 15% to 20% in addition to providing further clarity on the budget expectations and level of effort. In light of the fact that industry typically develops its teaming strategy and partners by RFP release a change in the definition of major subcontractor can have an impact on a team’s strategy, especially given the small business subcontracting goals of the solicitation. Can the Government reconsider the change to the definition of major subcontractor so that the originally provided 15% proposed costs definition is the one used for the purposes of evaluation?

Answer: The RFP encourages participation from small business. While the extent to which small businesses are utilized (RFP Section M.3.1) will be considered as part of Section M Evaluation Factors for Award, the threshold definition of 20% will not be the determining threshold for what constitutes “meaningful incorporation” (RFP, Cover letter) of small business in the proposal.

4. Amendment 4, page 5, Section F.8.2(a) states that the Chief of Party is required to have a “Master’s degree in a relevant subject area” plus “a minimum of ten years of demonstrated

relevant project management experience in developing countries.” Given the leadership, management and technical expertise that is gained from field experience, we respectfully request that USAID allow additional years of work experience to count in lieu of an advanced degree.

[Answer: USAID thanks you for your question and we have amended the RFP accordingly. Please refer to Section F.8.2 under Amendment No. 6](#)

5. Amendment 4, page 6, Section F.8.2(b) includes the following duties and responsibilities of the Deputy Chief of Party:

- “Responsible for project management, administration, and operations, including personnel management, performance management systems, financial management, and timely completion and submission of all activity deliverables.
- Assists with training staff and building local capacity of evaluation staff and/or subcontractors.”

The following required qualification is also included for the Deputy Chief of Party:

- “Proven ability as a facilitator/trainer and/or training manager.”

The first bullet listed above suggests that USAID is seeking a candidate with a strong background in Finance and Administration, which seems at odds with the training requirement. Providing training to evaluation staff is typically a highly technical skill set and therefore not done by managers in operations, finance or administration. Would USAID therefore consider removing the training job duties and requirement from the DCOP position, in favor of having this training performed by technical experts on the team?

[Answer: USAID thanks you for your question and we have amended the RFP accordingly. Please refer to Section F.8.2 under Amendment No. 6.](#)

6. In the Q&A, Questions 25 addresses a question about the Past Performance Matrix vs. the Past Performance Report forms that are available in PPIRS. Can USAID please confirm that the Offeror should submit in Annex D both the Past Performance Matrix as well as the associated applicable Past Performance Report forms from PPIRS?

[Answer: Please see answer to Question No. 7.](#)

7. Amendment 4, page 14, Section L.7.b.5 requires the submission of small business past performance information including three elements:

- A narrative describing the types of businesses and services performed, compliance elements, information about subcontracting plans, mitigating circumstances, etc.
- A list of 3 references, including names, titles addresses, phone numbers, etc.

- Subcontract reports if necessary per eSRS.

However, the list of approved annexes specifies only “Annex E – SF-294 Form (Subcontracting Report for Individual Contracts).”

Given the more lengthy requirements for all of the supporting information including references, compliance elements, subcontractor reports etc., we respectfully request that USAID allow all Small Business past performance information to be included in Annex E.

Answer: Past Performance matrix, past performance report forms, references and Past Performance information in using small business concerns (per Section L) must be included in Annex D and are not subject to the 15 pages limit. The requirements under Section L.7 (b)(5)(b) “(b) Describe any quality awards or certifications that indicate exceptional capacity to provide the service or product described in the statement of work”, must be included in the Technical Proposal and is subject to the 15 page limit.

8. We noticed there is a typo in Question 2 in the Q&A that raises a concern about the font size of the proposal.

- a. Could you please confirm that Offerors should use 11 point font?

Answer: Confirmed. The question 2 in the Q&A was an error on behalf of the questioner. Offerors must NOT use a type smaller than 11 point font, except for graphs, tables, textboxes and figures provided such tools are applied economically.

- b. Could you also confirm that Offerors may use a font size less than 11 for graphs, tables, textboxes and figures provided such tools are applied economically?

Answer: Confirmed. Offerors may use a font less than 11 ONLY for graphs, tables, textboxes and figures provided such tools are applied economically. Please see Amendment No. 6.

9. Could USAID confirm that Offerors may include additional past performance references in the body of the technical proposal other than the five references included in the Past Performance Matrix?

Answer: The past performance section under the technical proposal must include the requirements under Section L.7 (b)(5)(b) “(b) Describe any quality awards or certifications that indicate exceptional capacity to provide the service or product described in the statement of work”. This section may include references other than those listed in the Past Performance Matrix.

10. Could you please confirm that USAID will be pulling PPIRS forms separately and Offerors are not required to include them in the offer?

Answer: PPIRS forms must be provided by the offeror under Annex D.

11. USAID has indicated that offerors must not budget for field monitoring services, however, Section C of the RFP include a 5% LOE for field monitoring. Please clarify.

Answer: USAID does not anticipate Field Monitoring to be significantly ordered under this contract so it is included only as a percentage for the purposes of the LOE forecast aligning with the SOW objectives. For budgeting purposes, offerors are requested NOT to budget for Field Monitoring.

[End of Q&A- Amendment No. 6]